An Introduction to the Indirect Exposure Assessment Approach: Modeling Human Exposure Using Microenvironmental Measurements and the Recent National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS)*

Neil E. Klepeis†

December 1998

Abstract

Indirect exposure approaches offer a feasible and accurate method for estimating population exposures to indoor pollutants, including environmental tobacco smoke (ETS). In an effort to make the indirect exposure assessment approach more accessible to people in the health and risk assessment fields, this paper provides examples using real data from: (1) a week-long personal carbon monoxide monitoring survey conducted by the author; and (2) the 1992-94 National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS) for the United States. The indirect approach uses measurements of exposures in specific microenvironments (eg, homes, bars, offices), validated microenvironmental models (based on the mass balance equation), and human activity pattern data obtained from questionnaires to predict frequency distributions of exposure for entire populations. It requires fewer resources than the direct approach to exposure assessment, for which the distribution of monitors to a representative sample of a given population is necessary. In the indirect exposure assessment approach, average microenvironmental concentrations are multiplied by the total time spent in each microenvironment to give total integrated exposure. By assuming that the concentrations encountered in each of 10 location categories are the same for different members of the US population (i.e., the NHAPS respondents), the hypothetical contribution that environmental tobacco smoke makes to the average 24-hr respirable suspended particle exposure for Americans working their main job is calculated in this paper to be 18 $\mu g/m^3$. This paper is an illustrative review and does not contain an actual exposure assessment or model validation.

*This article is based on a presentation at the Workshop on Environmental Tobacco Smoke Exposure Assessment held 12-13 September 1997 at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. The workshop was sponsored by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and hosted by Dr. Jonathan M. Samet. This manuscript was subsequently published in Environmental Health Perspectives, Volume 107, Supplement 2, May 1999; Manuscript Number 3221SUP; Submitted in final form on 29-Dec-1998

†Send correspondence to: Neil Klepeis, 16475 Tarpey Road, Watsonville, CA 95076-9015. Email: nklepeis@uclink.berkeley.edu

KEY WORDS: Indirect Exposure Assessment Exposure Assessment, Exposure Modeling, Environmental Tobacco Smoke, Carbon Monoxide, Respirable Suspended Particles, Human Activity Patterns, The National Human Activity Pattern Survey, NHAPS.

ABBREVIATIONS: CO, carbon monoxide; ETS, environmental tobacco smoke; NHAPS, the 1992-1994 EPA-sponsored National Human Activity Pattern Survey; NHEXAS, national human exposure assessment survey; ppm, parts of air pollutant per million parts of air (also calculated as a ratio of gas volumes); PTEAM, particle total exposure assessment methodology; RSP, respirable suspended particles; TEAM, total exposure assessment methodology; US, United States; USEPA, United States Environmental Protection Agency; $\mu g/m^3$, micrograms of air pollutant per cubic meter of air.

1 Introduction

The indirect approach to exposure assessment was introduced approximately 15 years ago (1) and has been used to study exposure to carbon monoxide (2, 3), benzene exposure in Texas (4), respirable particle exposure in the San Francisco Bay Area (5, 6), benzene exposure (7), and, more recently, exposure to toxic compounds found in ETS (8, 9). Several exposure-modeling computer environments have been developed (10, 11, 12). However, the indirect approach has not yet gained widespread acceptance, even though accurate exposure assessments are crucial in determining safe levels of environmental pollutants (risk assessment) and in determining environmental factors that contribute to disease (epidemiology).

The indirect approach is a *modeling* approach that simulates exposures using (i) empirical distributions of exposure in specific microenvironments, (ii) output from microenvironmental models, and (iii) human activity pattern data. The main advantage of the indirect approach is that it can be used to rapidly and inexpensively calculate estimates of exposure over a wide range of exposure scenarios. Models can be used to determine the sensitivity of exposure levels to quantifiable parameters. For example, a computer program can be easily reconfigured to observe the impact of reducing air exchanges rates in workplace buildings around the US.

In contrast, the direct exposure assessment approach, as exemplified by such studies as the USEPA's TEAM and PTEAM studies (13, 14, 15), NHEXAS (16), and the more recent 16-city survey of ETS exposure (17), involves the deployment of a large number of perr, sonal or microenvironmental exposure monitors. In the direct approach, different exposure scenarios must be investigated by collecting additional data.

Although both the direct and indirect approaches give frequency distributions of exposure for a given population and its important subgroups (such as the strata of age, gender, race, geographic region, and work status), the indirect approach is typically much less expensive and time consuming. A main disadvantage of the indirect approach, as compared to the direct approach, is that there currently exists a research need for its systematic validation. That is, the results of a fully-developed indirect exposure assessment need to be compared to an independent set of directly-measured exposure levels. The data- intensive nature of the indirect approach, including the need for detailed human activity patterns, has made validation difficult (2), but the availability of new activity pattern and exposure concentration data bases $(16-20)$ is encouraging.

This paper is intended as an introduction to the indirect exposure assessment approach for those in epidemiology and other health-related fields. It is not intended to be an actual exposure assessment and does not contain a validation of modeling methods. It provides an illustration of the indirect exposure assessment methodology through the use of real pollutant concentration and activity pattern data.

In Section 2 of this paper, I introduce the concept of direct human exposure assessment by describing my week-long personal exposure profile for CO. Such a profile cannot be easily measured directly for a large number of people, but it can be approximated indirectly (i.e., through the indirect exposure assessment approach) by separate consideration of: (i) average microenvironmental pollutant concentrations; and (ii) the time spent being exposed in each microenvironment. Microenvironmental concentrations are determined from either measurements or a validated exposure model (e.g., an indoor air quality model). The time spent being exposed is obtained from questionnaires, such as the 24-hr recall diary used in the USEPA-sponsored NHAPS study (*19, 21-24*). In Section 3, I describe some results from NHAPS, including the time spent by Americans in locations where a smoker was reported to be present. Finally, Section 4 gives two examples of indirect exposure assessment calculations: (i) the 24-hr CO exposure concentration received by the author on December 16, 1997 from a variety of sources (unpublished data); and (ii) the estimated 24-hour RSP exposure concentration received by NHAPS respondents from ETS while working their main job.

2 Direct Exposure Measurements: Personal and Microenvironmental Monitoring

The most accurate way to determine exposures is to measure them using monitoring devices such as active integrating samplers (air pumped through filters at a fixed flow rate), passive integrating samplers, such as treated filters with a known theoretical flow rate (25), or instruments that can be used to collect real-time data, such as the Langan CO Personal Exposure Measurer (26) (Langan Products, Inc., San Francisco, CA) and the TSI Model 8510 piezobalance (TSI, Inc., Minneapolis, MN). The latter two instruments have been used successfully in previous field studies of ETS (27, 28). Large-scale exposure studies have deployed many samplers (usually integrated over 8-24 hrs or longer) to characterize ETS exposure (13, 17). These studies have been able to show significant increases in ETS constituent concentrations in locations (e.g., homes and offices) where there is smoking. However, the long sampling times used in these studies (12 to 24 hours) prevent us from drawing detailed conclusions for specific microenvironments.

Ideally, exposure measurements are: (i) highly-resolved in time (on the order of an hour or less), so exposures occurring in different locations and from different sources can be precisely differentiated; and (ii) collected for the same individual over extended time periods (days, weeks, or months), so that we obtain a complete and connected (autocorrelated) picture of the variation in a person's exposure. For example, I collected my own week-long CO exposure profile (using the Langan CO Personal Exposure Measurer) on a recent trip from the San Francisco Bay Area through Las Vegas, NV and Boston, MA. The profile consists of minute-by-minute CO concentrations matched with the precise times that different locations were entered (see Figure 1 and Table 1). Notice the substantial variation in CO exposure from day-to-day and location-to-location. Each location is associated with different sources of CO. This data base can be used to calculate both the average CO concentration and the time spent in each microenvironment. The microenvironments that were visited over the 7-day period included a smoky bar (12/12), a smoky casino buffet (12/13), a residence with gas heat (12/15-12/16), a smoky airport lounge (12/16), a home heated with oil (12/16-12/19), and many instances of being inside a vehicle in traffic.

Unfortunately, it would be too expensive and burdensome to collect and analyze real-time measurements for a large group of subjects, especially considering the massive quantity of data that is produced. For example, if 100 people were equipped with real-time CO personal monitors that stored readings every 5 min, a single day of readings would consist of 12 x 24 x 100 = 28,800 data points. In addition, the subjects would be tracked through up to 15 or more different locations, or microenvironments, over the 24-hour period (eg, home-bedroom, home-kitchen, front yard, car, playground, school-classroom, bus, etc.).

However, it is unnecessary to collect all of this information at once from each subject when each exposure segment can be determined separately. Since the most common microenvironments such as homes, schools, offices, bars, and restaurants have similar physical characteristics regardless of their locale (e.g., ventilation systems, furnishings, types of sources), exposure levels in each microenvironment can be studied individually with the full complement of real-time apparatus, and these results can be generalized to other nearly-identical microenvironments around the country using validated deterministic models (see discussion below). Microenvironmental exposure levels can also be adapted for new populations from representive surveys (i.e., direct exposure assessments) of a given area (*13-17, 29*). Subsequently, data on the time spent in each microenvironment, as determined from a study such as NHAPS (see Section 3), are combined with these microenvironment exposure levels, either from models or representative surveys, to produce a complete exposure profile for each subject (see Section 4).



Figure 1: The minute-by-minute carbon monoxide personal exposure profile as measured by the author between 4:30 pm on December 12, 1997 and 4:30 pm on December 19, 1997 using a Langan CO personal monitor and recorded with a Langan DataBear™ digital logger (previously unpublished data).

Table 1: Diary of Locations Visited During the Author's Week-Long CO Personal Monitoring Experiment

Date	Location	Observed Sources	Time Entered	Date	Location	Observed Sources	Time Entered
12/12/97	At a Friend's House in San Francisco		4:30 pm		Driving to Las Vegas, NV Airport		7:45 am
	At a Bar/Restaurant in San Francisco	Smkrs Pres	6:25 pm		Arriving at the Las Vegas Airport		8:10 am
	Back at Friend's House		9:00 pm		Boarding the Airplane		8:40 am
	Traveling on the 101N Freeway		11:00 pm		Arriving at Oakland, CA Airport		10:05 am
	At Home in Berkeley, CA		12:00 am		Riding Public Transit		10:20 am
12/13/97	Taking a Taxi to Oakland, CA Airport		6:00 am		Walking		11:30 am
	At the Oakland, CA Airport		6:15 am		Back at Home in Berkeley, CA		-
	Boarding the Aircraft		7:25 am	12/16/97	Driving to Oakland, CA Airport		10:25 am
	Arriving in Las Vegas, NV		10:00 am		Arriving at Oakland, CA Airport		10:50 am
	Driving to a Casino		10:15 am		Boarding Airplane		11:20 am
	Entering a Casino		10:40 am		Arriving at Phoenix, AZ Airport		1:09 pm
	Entering the Casino Buffet	Smkrs Pres	11:10 am		In Airport Cafe/Lounge	Smkrs Pres	1:34 pm
	Driving to a store		1:44 pm		In Main Airport Area		2:06 pm
	At a store		2:04 pm		Boarding Airplane		2:45 pm
	Traveling to a Friend's House (#1)		2:36 pm		Arriving in Boston, MA Airport		7:39 pm
	At House 1	Incense Burning	2:50 pm		Driving to Parent's House		8:15 pm
	Driving to Another Friend's House (#2)		-		Arriving at Parent's House		8:48 pm
	At House 2	Gas Heat On	5:20 pm	12/17/97	Remaining at Parent's House	Mnts Upstrs	-
	Party Begins	Some Smoking	9:00 pm		Remaining at Parent's House	Mntrs Dnstrs	8:49 pm
12/14/97	Drive to a Casino		8:30 am	12/18/97	Remaining at Parent's House	Mntrs Dnstrs	-
	Enter Casino (Diff. From Yesterday)		8:40 am	12/19/97	Drove to a Colleague's Office		9:58 am
	Enter Casino Buffet	No Vis. Smkrs.	-		Arrived at the Office		10:27 am
	Drive back to House 2		9:34 am		Drove to Wellesley College Dormitory		11:16 am
	At House 2		9:45 am		Arrived at Dormitory		11:45 am
	Driving to a Store		3:40 pm		Drove Back to Parent's House		12:05 pm
	Arriving at Store		4:10 pm		Arrived at Parent's House		1:02 pm
	Driving to another House (#3)				Drove to Restaurant		2:31 pm
	Arriving at House 3	Wd Smk Odor	4:48 pm		Arriving at Restaurant		2:33 pm
	Inside House 3		4:51 pm		Drove to Copy Store		3:50 pm
	Driving to a Store		5:12 pm		Arriving at Copy Store		4:12 pm
	In Store		5:30 pm		Drove back to Parent's House		6:26 pm
	Driving to another Casino (#3)		5:34 pm		Arriving at Parent's House	Mntrs Dnstrs	6:45 pm
	At Casino 3	Many Smokers	5:54 pm				
	Driving to Restaurant		6:18 pm				
	Arriving at Restaurant	Non-Smoking	6:25 pm				
	Driving to a Bar		8:35 pm				
	Arriving at a Bar	A Smoker	8:40 pm				
	Driving Back to House 1		10:12 pm				
	Arriving at House 1	Candles	10:20 pm				
12/15/97	Driving Back to House 2		12:10 am				
	Arriving at House 2		12:35 am				

Note: Times are all reported in Pacific Standard Time (PST). Abbreviations: Smk = smoke; Smkrs = smokers; Pres = present; Vis = visible; Wd smk = wood smoke; Mntrs Upstrs = monitors placed upstairs; Mntrs Dnstrs = monitors placed downstairs. Previously unpublished data.

2.1 Example

On a recent trip I took with some colleagues to a restaurant/bar in San Francisco where smoking was allowed (this visit is also part of the exposure profile presented in Figure 1 and Table 1), real-time RSP (measured using the TSI piezobalance) and CO concentrations (measured with the Langan Measurer) and counts of number of smokers were measured for a period of about 2 hrs (see Figure 2). The single-room venue had an approximate volume of 800 m^3, and there was an average of one smoker observed during the two hour time period (6:30 pm to 8:30 pm). After subtracting the average background levels (34 $\mu g/m^3$ for RSP from levels measured just outside the bar and 1.5 ppm for CO from levels measured inside a nearby residence where there was no smoking), the average RSP concentration was 68 $\mu g/m^3$ (n = 36; σ = 19; range = 36 - 116) and the average CO concentration was 1.75 ppm (n=119; σ = 0.4; range = 1.5 - 5). These CO and RSP average concentrations reflect the contribution that cigarettes made to the indoor air quality minus contributions from traffic and other outdoor sources (assuming the contribution from cooking was negligible). Before subtracting the background levels, RSP and CO average concentrations were 102 $\mu g/m^3$ and 3.25 ppm, respectively. Thus, the average RSP and CO concentrations were increased by 300% and 220%, respectively, due to the smoking of cigarettes. For a person visiting a similar venue where there was an average of one smoker present for the entire trip (and assuming the pollutants are attributable to the smokers and not cooking or other sources), a comparable average exposure concentration might be expected.

But what about for other venues and/or other conditions? We need to be able to extrapolate to situations where more smokers are present, or to rooms with different physical characteristics (e.g., room volumes or ventilation rates). We could either conduct a series of experiments in different kinds of establishments on a number of different days, or we could apply a valid indoor air quality model, which is the more cost-effective solution. For the current example, if there were twice as many smokers on average (and everything else remained the same), then, according to mathematical indoor air quality models based on the mass balance equation, the average RSP exposure concentration attributable to smoking would double over the two-hr time period from about 68 to about 136 $\mu g/m^3$. Halving the room volume or the pollutant removal rate would also result in a doubling of the two-hour exposure concentration.

Mathematical models that use the mass balance equation have been validated using real-time measurements in taverns (30), smoking lounges (27), and vehicles (28). Another article in this volume entitled "Modeling Indoor Air Quality from Environmental Tobacco Smoke" (31) discusses applications of the mass balance equation in some detail. These models assume that the air in each venue is reasonably well-mixed, which is the subject of yet another article in this volume entitled "The Validity of the Uniform Mixing Assumption: Determining Human Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke" (32).



Figure 2: Plot of carbon monoxide (CO) and respirable suspended particles (RSP) measured in a bar/restaurant on Friday, December 12, 1997 in San Francisco (previously unpublished data). The number of smokers present was observed at different times.

3 Time Americans Spend Being Exposed: The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS)

After exposure concentrations in specific microenvironments, such as the bar/restaurant described above, have been quantified, the time spent in these microenvironments must be determined before complete exposure profiles can be constructed (see Section 4). The time spent in microenvironments is obtained from human activity pattern surveys. These surveys sometimes rely on recall diaries, which ask people to remember the locations they visited for some specified time period (such as the 24-hour period of the previous day). To date, the recent NHAPS study $(19, 21 - 24)$ is the most complete survey of the time that Americans spend being exposed to toxic pollutants. Because of its significance to the indirect exposure assessment approach, I have included in this section a description of the main features of the NHAPS study.

NHAPS was carried out from 1992 to 1994 (8 seasonal quarters) for the USEPA by the University of Maryland's Survey Research Center (22). A total of 9,386 respondents were interviewed across the 48 contiguous states about their exposure to air and water contaminants encountered throughout their daily lives.

NHAPS was patterned after the 1987-1990 California Activity Pattern studies of adults and children sponsored by the California Air Resources Board $(33 - 35)$, which collected data on the potential exposure of Californians to common pollutants. These studies (including NHAPS) used a random-digit-dialing methodology to contact potential respondents by telephone, whereupon 24-hour recall diaries were collected from each respondent to capture minute-by-minute accounts of their daily routine. For NHAPS, the diaries were coded into 82 locations (e.g., home, bar, restaurant, office, school), 91 activities (e.g., food preparation, housekeeping, being at work), and whether or not a smoker was ever present. Thus, these telephone surveys give detailed time-of-day information on where and for how long individuals are exposed to ETS. In addition, both studies queried respondents on specific exposure events (eg, the number of cigarettes smoked or the type of heat used at home) through a number of "follow-up" questions. Background information including age, gender, race, education, health, and employment status was collected in the NHAPS study, but data were not collected on specific occupational classifications. This weakness in the NHAPS study limits our ability to conduct detailed characterizations of occupational exposures.

Table 2 contains the general categories of information that were collected in the NHAPS 24-hour recall diaries and follow-up questions. Approximately half the respondents were given one questionnaire (questionnaire A) and half were given another (questionnaire B), which collected similar general information but was focused on different kinds of exposure. The overall NHAPS response rate was about 63% (although it was lower during the first quarter due to difficulties in data collection).

The NHAPS *24-hour recall diary* data contain no missing values, probably because the respondents were guided by the interviewers to classify every minute of the day into a

Table 2: Background Factors and Summary of Question Types for NHAPS Questionnaires Version A and Version B

Background (Grouping) Factors	Version A (∼50% of Respondents)	Version B (∼50% of Respondents)
Biological (Age, Race, Gender) **Status** (Employment, Education) **Role** (Children, Other Adults, Work Hours, Work Evening, Work Outdoors) **Geographic** (Zipcodes-Home, Zipcodes-Work, Housing, Structure, Stories, Rooms, Carpet, Basement, Garage) **Life-Style** (Health)	**Air - Storage** (Gas Cans, Lawnmower, Paints, Mothballs, Deodorizer, Humidifier, Windows Open, Doors Open) **Air - Yesterday** (Smoking-Home/Away, Others Smoke, Paints, Open Flame, Glues, Solvents, Pesticides, Floor Wax, Gas-Powered Equipment, Cleaning Agents, Excessive Dust, Stain Removers, Perfumes, Nail Polish, Gas-Station, Gas Stove, Microwave, Aerosol Spray, Heating, Heavy Traffic, Roadway, Parking Garage, Walk to Car) **Water** (Shower/Bath, Dishwasher, Washing Machine) **Ingestion** (Children-Soil) **24-Hour Diary** (Activities, Locations, Smoking, Hard Breathing)	**Air - Storage** (Gas, Lawnmower, Paints, Solvents) **Air - Last 6 Months** (Renovations, Paint, Floors, Addition, Carpets, Glues, Sleep Elsewhere, Pesticides, Vacuum Floors, Humidifier, Gas Stove, Heat Sources) **Water** (Shower/Bath, Dishwashing, Washing Machine, Drinking Water-Bottle/Tap, Juices, Soft Drinks) **Water - Last Month** (Pool Swimming) **Ingestion** (Children-Soil, Seafood, Blackened Food) **24-Hour Diary** (Activities, Locations, Smoking, Hard Breathing)

Adapted from Robinson and Blair (22)

particular location and activity. In contrast to the 24-hour diaries, the *follow-up questions* contain a substantial amount of missing data, due, in part, to the dependence of certain questions on a "yes" response to another question. However, much of the missing data seems to have arisen from refusal or inability to answer questions. In addition, the follow-up questions were sometimes coded in a mixed-type format containing arbitrary divisions and groupings, making analysis difficult. Thus, the 24-hour diaries seem to be a better source of complete and accurate information on exposure events occurring in the U.S. population even though many follow-up questions are focused on important areas of exposure.

The main drawback of the 24-hour recall diary results is that we are forced to work with the arbitrary categories encoded by the original data collectors. Many of the activity categories appear to be more relevant to sociological issues than to different types of exposure. For example, the original activity codes are divided into general categories of Paid Work, Household Work, Child Care, Personal Needs/Care, Education, Entertainment/Social, Recreation, and Communication. Unfortunately, there is practically no information on specific types of exposures except for ETS, which occur during, say, housekeeping, food preparation, or being at work. We can identify times when people *may* be engaged in activities that could involve exposure, but there are few or no categories that pinpoint the precise type of exposure, except for the categories of smoker-presence and smoker-non-presence. Unfortunately, for most of the NHAPS study, respondents were not asked to specify for exactly what portion of the time the smoker was present in each location. Consequently, there is the possibility for substantial overestimation (or underestimation) of the duration of exposure to ETS.

In Figures 3 and 4, I present three statistics from a previous analysis of the NHAPS data (23): (i) the mean 24-hour cumulative duration of time spent in 10 grouped locations; (ii) the percentage of people who were in each grouped location for at least one minute on the diary day (i.e., the doers); and (iii) the percentage of time spent in each grouped location. These statistics are reported both for all the NHAPS respondents (Figure 3) and for those people who were exposed to ETS at least once on the diary day (Figure 4). The statistics have been corrected with demographic, geographic, and temporal weights (23). The numerator of the percentage of time spent is derived from the product of the number of people present in each location (and that were exposed to ETS) and the mean 24-hour cumulative time spent in that location. The denominator is the total time spent by all respondents (total sample size times 24 hours). The 10 grouped locations that we have used in these analyses are: Residential Indoors; Residential Outdoors; In Vehicle; Near Vehicle; Other Outdoor; Office/Factory; Mall/Store; School/Public Bldg; Bar/Restaurant; and Other Indoor. Detailed descriptive statistics tables (unweighted) of many 24-hour diary categories and nearly all of the follow-up questions including histograms and cumulative frequency distributions are available from Tsang and Klepeis (24). The analyses are broken down by 12 background variables including age, gender, race, employment status, education, and several health-related variables.

a.



b.



Figure 3: (a) The 24-hour average time that NHAPS respondents spent in each location and the percentage of NHAPS respondents who reported being in each location. (b) The over all percentage of time spent by the NHAPS respondents in each location. Both (a) and (b) are adapted from Klepeis et al. (23).



Figure 4: (a) The 24-hour average time that NHAPS respondents spent exposed to ETS in each location and the percentage of NHAPS respondents exposed to ETS in each location. (b) Pie chart showing the percentage of time spent being exposed to ETS in each location. Both (a) and (b) consider only those respondents who were exposed to ETS at least once on the diary day. Adapted from Klepeis et al. (23).

3.1 Selected Results

Of any location, Americans spend the largest amount of time in the home (69%) followed by the school (7%), a vehicle (6%), and an office or factory (5%) (see Figure 3). They spend a total of 92% of the time indoors or in a vehicle. The largest mean 24-hour cumulative durations are for the home (1,000 min), the office/factory (390 min), and school or some other publicbuilding (280 min). The locations for which there was the largest percentage of people spending at least one minute were the home (99%) and a vehicle (83%). Thus, significantly long occupational exposures in the population can be occurring for workers in an office or factory or for workers required to operate a vehicle. More people may be experiencing exposures in vehicles, but the duration of the exposures are shorter than those in the office, factory, or in public buildings.

3.2 ETS Exposures

In Table 3, I have summarized the variables in the NHAPS data base that are relevant to occupational, as well as non-occupational, ETS exposure. Of the 9,386 total NHAPS respondents, 4,005 report having been exposed to ETS during the day. When we consider only those respondents who were exposed to ETS for at least one minute on the diary day (45% of the total weighted sample size), we see that Americans are exposed for the largest amount of time in the home (48%), followed by offices or factories (10%) and bars/restaurants (9%) (23) (see Figure 4). The longest exposures to ETS (mean 24-hour duration) occur in offices or factories (360 min) and the home (300 min). The largest percentages of people are exposed at home (60%), in a vehicle (30%), and in a bar or restaurant (23%).

Of the 4,005 people exposed to ETS, 1,619 were exposed while working their main job (36). The 24-hour average duration of exposure and sample are given in Table 4. The table also presents the total time spent in each location by all respondents, obtained by multiplying the sample size, n, by the average duration, d.

4 Estimating Human Exposure Indirectly: Microenvironmental Concentrations Weighted by Time Spent

To estimate the total exposure of a person, we multiply measurements taken in separate microenvironments such as bars, restaurants, vehicles, homes, and offices by the time that is spent there as determined from questionnaires such as the NHAPS 24-hr recall diary. Mathematically, we express a person's total exposure by (1):

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^{I} t_i c_i \tag{1}$$

Table 3: The 24-hour Recall Diary and Follow-up NHAPS Variables That Are Relevant to Environmental Tobacco Smoke Exposure (Both Occupational and Non-Occupational)

24-HOUR RECALL DIARY

Ten Regrouped NHAPS Locations [a]

1. Inside a Residence
2. Outdoors at a Residence
3. Inside a Vehicle
4. Traveling Outside or Near a Roadway or Vehicle (eg, riding a bike or motorcycle, walking, or waiting for the bus)
5. Some Other Outdoor Location (eg, the School Grounds or a Park)
6. Office or Factory
7. Mall, Grocery Store, or Other Store
8. School, Church, Hospital, or Other Public Building
9. Bar or Restaurant
10. Some Other Indoor Location (eg, a health club, the cleaners, a beauty parlor, or a hotel/motel)

NHAPS Activities

Working a Main Job
Traveling During Work
Working a Second Job
On Break During Work

Smoker Presence

Smoker Present
No Smoker Present

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

Did the respondent smoke cigarettes yesterday and for how many minutes did they smoke?
Did the respondent smoke cigars or tobacco yesterday and for how many minutes did they smoke?
Did someone smoke cigarettes at the respondents home yesterday and how many cigarettes did they smoke?
How many cigarettes did the respondent smoke outside the house yesterday?
Is smoking allowed in the respondents home?
How many household members smoke at home?
How many total cigarettes were smoked at home?

[a]The listed locations are broad location categories that were created by grouping the original 83 NHAPS location codes.

Table 4: 24-Hour Average and Population Minutes Spent by Americans[a] Exposed to ETS While Working Their Main Job (n = 1619 total)

	Resid. Indoor	Resid. Outdoor	In Vehicle	Near Vehicle	Other Outdoor	Office/ Factory	Mall/ Store	Public Bldg.	Bar/ Rest.	Other Indoor
Sample Size, *n*	91	28	73	131	64	747	144	206	135	161
24-Hour Average, *d*	270	254	264	423	401	467	442	448	411	444
Total Sample[b]	24,570	7,112	19,272	55,413	25,664	348,849	63,648	92,288	55,485	71,484

[a]Respondents to the USEPA's National Human Activity Pattern Survey. [b]The 24-hour cumulative time spent exposed to ETS for all respondents in the sample is obtained by multiplying the sample size in each location by the 24-hour average time spent in each location. Source: Tsang, unpublished data (36).

where E = the person's total integrated exposure, c_i = the concentration of pollutant in microenvironment i, t_i = the time spent in microenvironment i, and I = the total number of microenvironments. The person's average exposure is simply E divided by the total time period of interest (e.g., 24 hrs = 1,440 minutes). In general, we would like to have knowledge of a connected (autocorrelated) time series of microenvironments with different microenvironments defined for different times-of-day, weather conditions, geographic regions, seasons, etc. Such detailed information is typically unavailable. As an approximation, we usually assume (as I do in this paper) that identical locations imply identical microenvironments.

For example, take the author's detailed CO exposure profile for Tuesday, December 16 (see Figure 5, a detail of Figure 1). In this case, we have available the average CO concentration in each of five microenvironments differentiated only by location (I have averaged concentrations over both contiguous and non-contiguous minutes in each location): (i) the home with gas heating; (ii) driving in the car on the freeway; (iii) in the airport; (iv) on an airplane; and (v) the home heated with oil. Using the Equation and the average concentration and total time spent in each microenvironment (over the 24-hour period), we calculate the 24-hr average CO exposure to be 4 ppm (see Table 5), which is the same concentration that is obtained by averaging over every minute in the 1440-minute (24-hour) time series.

Seldom are both detailed activity pattern information and concentration data available for a representative sample of individuals as they are for my small-scale experiment. In estimating exposures for entire populations, we consider the total time spent in a number of standardized microenvironments such as the NHAPS locations in Table 2. If we then assume that every person interviewed in the NHAPS study experiences the same ETS-derived average RSP exposure concentration while working in each microenvironment (i.e., point estimates of exposure in each location), we obtain an average 24-hr RSP exposure concentration of 18 $\mu g/m^3$ (see Table 6). This method does not allow for determining the variability in exposure.

In a more realistic calculation, different concentrations for each person and each location would be randomly sampled from empirical distributions using the Monte-Carlo



DataBear™ Measurer
Langan Products, Inc.

Figure 5: Plot of the author's personal CO exposure profile on December 16, 1997 as he traveled through microenvironments in a home with gas heat and smokers (midnight to 10:25 AM), in a home heated with oil (8:48 PM to midnight), in a vehicle driving on the freeway (10:25 - 10:50 AM and 8:15 PM to 8:48 PM), in an airport (10:50 to 11:20 AM and 1:09 to 1:34 PM), in a smoky airport café/lounge (1:34 to 2:06 PM), and on an airplane (11:20 AM to 1:09 PM and 2:45 to 7:39 PM). This plot is a detail from Figure 1.

Table 5: Calculation of the Author's 24-hr Average CO Exposure on Tuesday, December 16, 1997

Microenvironment	Average Conc [ppm]	Time Spent [min]	Conc x Time [ppm-min]
At Home with gas heat	5.2	631	3281
In Car on Freeway	4.6	50	230
Airport	3.9	145	566
Airplane Cabin	2.4	425	1020
Home heated with oil	3.7	189	699
Total		1440	5796

Average 24-hr Concentration = 5796 ppm-min / 1440 min = 4.0 ppm

Abbrev: Conc = concentration

method or obtained from a mathematical model based on the mass balance equation. In this way, a more realistic frequency distribution of exposures can be determined for the given population, complete with standard deviations and percentiles of exposure. Examples of such calculations are available in published articles (7, 9). Since models based on the indirect exposure assessment approach depend on large amounts of data for a population, very few studies have been able to conduct a complete validation procedure. When multiple and independent exposure concentration data bases become available for a population, such validations should become more commonplace. For now, we rely on the accuracy of activity pattern data sets such as NHAPS and validated indoor air quality models to produce accurate frequency distributions of exposure.

Estimates of exposure using Equation 1 are most accurate when fairly specific microenvironments are used. As a rule, the better we know exact microenvironmental exposure levels, the more accurate will be our assessment of exposure using the indirect approach. Time periods of 12-24 hours are probably too long, since most people probably change their activities from hour-to-hour and high exposures levels for short time periods (e.g., 2-4 hours) are not pinpointed. Exceptions may be for sleeping and occupational settings, where people are typically exposed in 8-hour-long segments. However, the occupational exposure levels are probably not constant over the work shift and individuals may spend varying amounts of time being exposed.

If multiple sources of RSP are present throughout a person's daily routine, the contributions can be added together according to a mathematical rule called the principle of superposition, which assumes the well-mixed model assumption holds. For example, if measurements or a model show that RSP from cigarettes typically contributes, on aver-

Table 6: The 24-hr Average RSP Exposure Concentration from ETS for Americans* Working Their Main Job

Microenvironment w/ Smoker	[a]**Ave Conc [μg/m^3]**	[b]**Sample Size**	[c]**Ave Time Spent [min]**	[d]**Conc x Time [(μg/m^3)-min]**
Residential - Indoors	40	91	270	982,800
Residential - Outdoors	20	28	254	142,240
In Vehicle	300	73	264	5,781,600
Near Vehicle	30	131	423	1,662,390
Other Outdoor	30	64	401	769,920
Office/Factory	50	747	467	17,442,450
Bar/Restaurant	60	135	411	3,329,100
Mall/Store	40	144	442	2,545,920
School/Public Bldg	50	206	448	4,614,400
Other Indoor	60	161	444	4,289,040
Total				41,559,860

Average 24-hr Conc = 41,559,860 (μg/m^3)-min / (1440 min * 1619 people) = 18 μg/m^3

*Respondents to the USEPA's National Human Activity Pattern Survey who reported they were exposed to ETS while at their main job (activity code = 1). See Table 4. [a]The average microenvironmental concentrations are hypothetical and assumed to be the same for each person (a fairly unrealistic assumption). A more realistic calculation would multiply the time spent by each person in a given microenvironment by different exposure concentrations, which are either sampled from an empirical distribution of exposures (using the Monte Carlo method) or obtained from a deterministic model (31). [b]The sample size is the number of NHAPS respondents that visited each location. [c]Average time spent in each location. The product of the sample size and the 24-hour average time spent in each location across all respondents gives the total time spent by all respondents in each location (see Table 4). [d]Product of the total time spent in each location (sample size time average time spent) and the hypothetical microenvironmental concentrations.

age, 60 μg/m^3 in a restaurant and the contribution from cooking averages 10 μg/m^3, a person in a smoky bar where there is cooking going on would receive, on average, a total of 70 μg/m^3 of RSP exposure. Exposure from other sources of RSP besides ETS, such as vehicle emissions, wood burning, or cooking, could also be included and the contribution of each source to the total exposure could be examined.

Population exposures can be recalculated for any hypothetical microenvironmental concentrations to explore the effects of different control strategies. For example, suppose occupational exposures to ETS in vehicles were drastically reduced by a smoking ban, what would happen to the national average exposure? For the example given above, the average RSP exposure would decrease from 18 to 15 μg/m^3. Thus, we predict that ETS exposure in vehicles contributes, on average, 3 μg/m^3 to the overall U.S. occupational exposure.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, I have illustrated the indirect approach to exposure assessment by showing how the average 24-hr exposure concentration determined from an actual minute-by-minute exposure profile can be approximated by summing the product of two components: (i) average microenvironmental concentrations obtained from models or measurements; and (ii) the time spent in each microenvironment. Once these components are representatively-determined for a population, a realistic frequency distribution of exposures can be calculated for the status quo and nearly any hypothetical exposure control scenario. It is possible to examine fractions of a 24-hr period and individual locations and pollutant sources. The existence of (i) representative surveys of exposure to ETS components in many microenvironments, (ii) validated ETS models for microenvironments such as the car, the tavern, and the smoking lounge, and (iii) a nationally-representative survey of human activity patterns should compel exposure assessors to make use of this powerful and inexpensive approach.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Wayne Ott and Lee Langan for their assistance in using the particle and CO monitors and for helping to collect data in the San Francisco bar.

References

1. Duan N. Microenvironment types: a model for human exposure to air pollution. *Environ Int* 8:305-309 (1982).

2. Ott WR, Thomas J, Mage D, Wallace L. Validation of the simulation of human activity and pollutant exposure model using paired days from the Denver, CO, carbon monoxide field study. *Atmos Environ* 22:2101-2113 (1988).

3. Glen G and Shadwick D. Final Technical Report on the Analysis of Carbon Monoxide Exposures for Fourteen Cities Using HAPEM-MS3. Research Triangle Park: Mantech Environmental Technologies, Inc., 1997.

4. Behar JV, Thomas J, and Pandian MD. Estimation of the Exposure to Benzene of Selected Populations in the State of Texas Using the Benzene Exposure Assessment Model (BEAM). EPA 600/X-93/002. Las Vegas: Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, USEPA, 1993.

5. Lurmann FW and Korc ME. Characterization of Human Exposure to Ozone and PM-10 in the San Francisco Bay Area. Final Report STI-93150-1416 FR. San Francisco: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 1994.

6. Klepeis NE, Ott WR, and Switzer P. A Total Human Exposure Model (THEM) for Respirable Suspended Particles (RSP). National Technical Information Service (NTIS) No. PB94-197415. Presented at the 87th annual meeting of the A&WMA meeting in Cincinnati, OH, 1994.

7. Macintosh MD, Xue J, Ozkaynak H, Spengler JD, Ryan PB. A population-based exposure model for benzene. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 5:375-403 (1995).

8. Miller SL. Assessing Exposure to Air Toxicants from Environmental Tobacco Smoke: A Monte-Carlo Based Assessment of Californian Exposures. Presented at the International Society of Exposure Analysis (ISEA) Meeting, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, November 2-5, 1997.

9. Miller SL, Branoff S, Nazaroff WW. Exposure to toxic air contaminants in environmental tobacco smoke: an assessment for California based on personal monitoring data. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 8:287-311 (1998).

10. McCurdy T. Estimating exposure to selected motor vehicle pollutants using the NEM series of models: lessons to be learned. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 4:251-260 (1995).

11. Koontz MD, Evans WC, Wilkes CR. Development of a Model for Assessing Indoor Exposure to Air Pollutants. Final Report A933-157. Geomet Report IE2631. Sacramento: California Air Resources Board, 1998.

12. Hern SC, Robertson GL, Butler LC, et al. Reaching 'THERdbASE' in Human Exposure Research. Poster presentation for 214th American Chemical Society National Meeting, September 7-11, 1997, Las Vegas, NV, 1997.

13. Wallace LA. The Total Exposure Assessment Methodology (TEAM) Study: Summary and Analysis: Volume I. Washington, D.C: USEPA, 1987.

14. Wallace LA. The total exposure assessment methodology (TEAM) study – an analysis of exposures, sources, and risks associated with 4 volatile organic chemicals. *J Am College Toxicol* 8:883-895 (1989).

15. Thomas KW, Pellizzari ED, Clayton CA, Whitaker DA, et al. Particle total exposure assessment methodology (PTEAM) 1990 study – method performance and data quality for personal indoor and outdoor monitoring. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 3:203-226 (1993).

16. Sexton K, Kleffman DE, and Callahan MA. An introduction to the national human exposure assessment survey (NHEXAS) and related phase 1 field studies. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 5:229-232 (1995).

17. Jenkins RA, Palausky A, Counts RW, Bayne CK, Dindal AB, Guerin MR. Exposure to environmental tobacco smoke in sixteen cities in the united states as determined by personal breathing zone air sampling. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 6:473-502 (1996).

18. Wilson AL, Colome SD, Tian Y, Becker EW, et al. California residential air exchange rates and residence volumes. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 6:311-326 (1996).

19. Klepeis NE, Nelson WC, Tsang AM, et al. The national human activity pattern survey (NHAPS): data collection and selected results. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* (submitted, September 1998).

20. Glen G, Lakkadi Y, Tippett JA and del Valle-Torres M. Development of NERL/CHAD: The National Human Exposure Research Laboratory Consolidated Human Activity Pattern Database. Research Triangle Park: Mantech Environmental Technologies, Inc., 1997.

21. Nelson WC, Ott WR and Robinson JP. The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): Use of Nationwide Activity Data for Human Exposure Assessment. Paper no. 94-WA75A.01, presented at the 87th Annual Meeting and Exhibition of the Air & Waste Management Association, 1994.

22. Robinson JP and Blair J. Estimating Exposure to Pollutants Through Human Activity Pattern Data: The National Microenvironmental Activity Pattern Survey. Annual Report, Project CR-816183, University of Maryland: Survey Research Center, 1995.

23. Klepeis NE, Tsang AM and Behar JV. Analysis of the National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS) Responses from a Standpoint of Exposure Assessment. EPA/600/R-96/074. Contract 68-01-7325 to Information Systems and Services, Inc., Las Vegas, NV: USEPA, 1996.

24. Tsang AM and Klepeis NE. A Detailed Analysis of the National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS) Data. EPA/600/R-96/148.Contract 68-W5-001. Delivery Order No. 13 to Lockheed Martin, 980 Kelly Johnson Drive, Las Vegas, NV: USEPA, 1996.

25. Hammond SK and Leaderer BP. A diffusion monitor to measure exposure to passive smoking. *Environ Sci Technol* 21:494 – 497 (1987).

26. Langan L. Portability in measuring exposure to carbon monoxide. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol*, *Suppl* 1:223-239 (1992).

27. Klepeis NE, Ott WR, Switzer P. A multiple smoker model for predicting indoor air quality in public lounges. *Environ Sci Technol* 30:2813-2820 (1996).

28. Ott WR, Langan L, Switzer P. A time series model for cigarette smoking activity patterns: model validation for carbon monoxide and respirable suspended particles in a chamber and an automobile. *J Exposure Anal Environ Epidemiol* 2:175-200 (1992).

29. Ott WR, Switzer P, Klepeis NE. Measuring Indoor and Outdoor Particles and Carbon Monoxide in 199 Venues in Three Cities. Presented at the ISEA Meeting and Exhibition, Research Triangle Park, NC, 1997.

30. Ott WR, Switzer P, Robinson JP. Particle concentrations inside a tavern before and after prohibition of smoking: evaluating the performance of an indoor air quality model. *J Air Waste Manag Assoc* 46:1120-1134 (1996).

31. Ott WR. Modeling indoor air quality from environmental tobacco smoke. *Environ Health Perspect* (in press).

32. Klepeis NE. The validity of the uniform mixing assumption: determining human exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *Environ Health Perspect* (in press).

33. Jenkins PL, Phillips TJ, Mulberg EJ, Hui SP. Activity patterns of Californians: use of and proximity to indoor pollutant sources. *Atmos Environ* 26A:2141 – 2148 (1992).

34. Wiley JA, Robinson JP, Piazza T, Garret K, Cirksena K, Cheng U, Martin G. Activity Patterns of California Residents. Final Report Under Contract No. A6-177-33. Sacramento: California Air Resources Board, 1991.

35. Wiley JA, Robinson JP, Piazza T, Stork L, Pladsen K. Study of Children's Activity Patterns. Final Report Under Contract No. A733-149. Sacramento: California Air Resources Board, 1991.

36. Tsang AM, personal communication (December 29, 1997).